

entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$1,000, conditioned in part that it be reprocessed so that it contain not less than 80 per cent of milk fat.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**17421. Misbranding of smoked hams and shoulders. U. S. v. Colonial Provision Co. (Inc.). Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$25. (F. & D. No. 23723. I. S. Nos. 02493, 02494.)**

On August 26, 1929, the grand jurors of the United States within and for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, upon presentment by the United States attorney for said district returned in the District Court of the United States for the district aforesaid an indictment in two counts against the Colonial Provision Co. (Inc.), a corporation, Boston, Mass., alleging shipment by said company, in violation of the food and drugs act as amended, on August 8, 1928, from the State of Massachusetts into the State of Rhode Island, of quantities of smoked hams and shoulders which were misbranded. The articles were labeled in part: "Colonial Brand Master-Smoked Ham [or "Shoulder"] Net Weight lbs. oz. Colonial Provision Co. Inc. Boston, Mass."

It was charged in the indictment that the articles were misbranded in that they were food in package form and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the packages.

On November 4, 1929, a plea of nolo contendere to the indictment was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**17422. Adulteration of cheese. U. S. v. 9 Boxes of Cheese. Decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23655. I. S. No. 01352. S. No. 1894.)**

On April 25, 1929, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 9 boxes of cheese, remaining in the original unbroken packages at St. Paul, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Hudson Prairie Cheese Co., from Hudson, Wis., on April 10, 1929, and transported from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Minnesota, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "H. A. Dreves Co., St. Paul, Minn."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that excessive moisture had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the said article.

On December 31, 1929, the H. A. Dreves Co., Minneapolis, Minn., having appeared as claimant for the property, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$350, conditioned in part that it be ground and disposed of in a manner approved by this department.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

**17423. Adulteration and misbranding of cheese. U. S. v. 35 Boxes, et al., of Cheese. Decree of condemnation. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23569. I. S. Nos. 01330, 01331, 01332. S. No. 1825.)**

On April 5, 1929, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 35 boxes of twin daisies cheese, 49 boxes of longhorns cheese, and 42 boxes of triple daisies cheese, remaining in the original unbroken packages at St. Paul, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Summit Cooperative Dairy, from Wilson, Wis., on March 21, 1929, and transported from the State of Wisconsin into the State of Minnesota, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act. The article was labeled in part: "Genuine Colby State of Wisconsin Department of Markets Wisconsin No. 1."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that excessive moisture had been mixed and packed with and substituted in part for the said article.